



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/008,282	11/07/2001	Patrick Leempoel	SN - 116	2719
7590 01/29/2004 MCKELLAR STEVENS & HILL POSEYVILLE PROFESSIONAL COMPLEX 784 SOUTH POSEYVILLE ROAD			EXAMINER	
			MOORE, MARGARET G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MIDLAND, N	Al 48640		1712	

DATE MAILED: 01/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		111
. 5	Application No.	Applicant(s)
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	10/008,282	LEEMPOEL ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Margaret G. Moore	1712
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address
• •	N. V. IO OET TO EVOIDE - I	AONTHAN EDOM
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a ri - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the main earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thi od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI tute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26	November 2003	
	nis action is non-final.	
<i>,</i> —		tore manageration on to the acceptance
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	•	• •
Disposition of Claims 6-9, 11-18		
4) Claim(s) 1 to 4, 6 to 18 is/are pending in the	• •	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdown	rawn from consideration.	
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 to 4, 6 to 14, 17 and 18</u> is/are allo	owed.	
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>15, 16</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.	
pplication Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a	ccepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	ne drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152.
riority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:		§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure 	ents have been received in Ariority documents have beer	· · · ———
* See the attached detailed Office action for a li 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome since a specific reference was included in the 37 CFR 1.78.	stic priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(e) (to a provisional application)
a) The translation of the foreign language p	• •	
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome reference was included in the first sentence of		
ttachment(s)		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)

Application/Control Number: 10/008,282

Art Unit: 1712

1. The amendment filed 11/26/03 is incorrect in that it indicates that claim 5 is pending when in fact this claim was deleted in the amendment filed November 7, 2001. The subject matter of this claim was included in claims 17 and 18, also filed November 7, 2001. In response to this office action applicants are requested to send a corrected version of the pending claims.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Knepper et al.

Applicants have amended the process claims such that include the limitation of previous claim 10, which was indicated as being allowable. However these claims are drawn to a product rather than the process. Applicants have not provided any argument or evidence that the claimed product is, in fact, inherently different from the product prepared by Knepper et al. While the claims include a process limitation, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. If the product in a product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. In the instant application, it does not appear that the order of addition would result in an inherently different product. These claims are rejected as being inherently the same as that found in Knepper et al.

Art Unit: 1712

6-9,11-14

5. Claims 1 to 4, 6 to 14, 17 and 18 are allowed. The prior art fails to teach or suggest the particular order for mixing the ingredients as claimed.

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Margaret G. Moore whose telephone number is 571-272-1090. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Wednesday and Friday, 10am to 4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (571) 272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Margaret FG. Moore Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1712

mgm 1/26/04